DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 316 PS 030 565

AUTHOR	Stipek, Deborah; Ogawa, Terry
TITLE	Early Childhood Education. Building Community Systems for Young Children.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities.
SPONS AGENCY	David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.
PUB DATE	2000-07-00
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities, Box 951772, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1772 ($5). Tel: 310-206-1898; Fax: 310-206-3180. For full text: http://healthychild.ucla.edu.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	At Risk Persons; *Child Care; *Delivery Systems; Early Intervention; Educational Policy; Educational Quality; Low Income Groups; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; *Public Policy; State Programs; State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	California; Day Care Licensing; Day Care Quality; Program Characteristics; *Proposition 10 (California 1998); Subsidized Child Care Services

ABSTRACT

As part of a series of reports designed to support the implementation of Proposition 10: The California Children and Families Act and to provide comprehensive and authoritative information on critical issues concerning young children and families in California, this report summarizes research on the effects of early childhood education and findings on the effects of various program characteristics. The report also describes California's licensing standards for child care programs and the system of subsidized programs. Arguing that social factors have converged to make the present time especially auspicious for rethinking the current state of child care and early childhood education, the report describes local efforts to create a user-friendly child care infrastructure. The report maintains that key to the success of these efforts are the leadership of the organizations, their funding sources, and their common understanding and commitment to share decision making, community organizing and building, and flexible resource allocation. The report asserts that Proposition 10 provides an opportunity to create a unified, coordinated system of child care and development for all families and presents examples of activities that Proposition 10 could support. The report's two appendices list state and national informational resources on early childhood education programs and services and lists expert individual contacts. (Contains 83 references.) (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 467 316

UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities

Building Community Systems for Young Children

Building Community Systems for Young Children is a series of reports designed to support the implementation of Proposition 10: The California Children and Families Act. Each installment is written by a team of experts and provides comprehensive and authoritative information on critical issues concerning young children and families in California.

July 2000

Early Childhood Education

By

Deborah Stipek, PhD
UCLA School of Education and Information Studies
Director, Seeds University Elementary School

and

Terry Ogawa, MA
City of Los Angeles,
Commission for Children, Youth and Their Families

PS 030565

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ericka Tullis
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUGGESTED CITATION:
Stipek, D and T Ogawa, *Early Childhood Education,* in N Halfon, E Shulman, M Hochstein and M Shannon, eds., Building Community Systems for Young Children, UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities, 2000.

Copyright © 2000 UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities.

Edited by Neal Halfon, MD, MPH, Ericka Shulman, MPP, Miles Hochstein, PhD, Michael Shannon, MA

Building Community Systems for Young Children has been made possible through generous support from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

Permission to copy and disseminate this document is granted as long as proper credit is given to the UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities.

Single copies of this report are available for $5 each by writing the UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities, Box 951772, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1772. Phone (310) 206-1898. This document may be found on the web site of the UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities (http://healthychild.ucla.edu).

Table of Contents

I. Introduction/Background 1

II Research on the Effects of Early Childhood Education 2

III. Evaluation of Existing Systems and Programs 8

IV. Integrating and Coordinating Systems and Programs 10

V. Integrating and Coordinating Funding 12

VI. Recommendations 14

VII. Appendix A: Informational Resources 16

VIII. Appendix B: Expert Individual Contacts 23

IX. Bibliography 26

X. Endnotes 30

Early Childhood Education

I. Introduction/Background

Based on directions outlined in Proposition 10, The California Children and Families Initiative, the State Commission for the California Children and Families Initiative identified three strategic results:

1) Improved Family Functioning: Strong Families
2) Improved Child Development: Children Learning and Ready for School
3) Improved Child Health: Healthy Children

According to strategic result number two, which specifically addresses early childhood education, "The importance of preparing children to succeed in school is critical. The role of education in a child's later ability to create a healthy, fulfilling life has been well documented. And recent research on early brain development has shown the critical role of children's environments. Skills that allow one to problem solve and think creatively are developed in early childhood education settings and nurtured through community and parental involvement."[1]

To achieve the goals identified above, the State Commission developed guidelines for a comprehensive and integrated program, focused on enhancing children's development in early childhood. Although counties are not required to follow these guidelines, they offer a framework that can be used to evaluate existing programs and systems and to plan new coordinated and interwoven services.

Strategic result number two targets the availability and provision of high-quality, accessible and affordable "child care and early education programs." A clear distinction between "child care" and "early education" is not made in the Guidelines, as is often the case in other policy and research documents on this issue. Because another background report has been commissioned on child care, we have tried in this report to distinguish between programs that are primarily designed to care for children so that parents can work, and programs that are primarily designed as educational interventions to promote children's cognitive and social development.[2]

The distinction in purposes (caring for children versus promoting skills) makes conceptual sense, but practically it is no longer meaningful. The children of low-income parents most in need of subsidized day care are the same children who are at greatest risk of school failure, and thus most in need of early childhood education. Head Start, the nation's largest and best-known early education program, is struggling to address the increased needs for full-time day care for its enrollees, and other half-day preschool programs are becoming increasingly impractical as well.

By the same token, children who receive subsidized day care need a cognitively stimulating, language-rich, and educational environment. Accordingly, although we attempt to focus primarily on early childhood education in this report, we suggest that policymakers consider establishing or

revising programs to consolidate these two purposes. Consideration also needs to be given to working-poor families who are not eligible for Head Start or subsidized care.

A number of intervention strategies have been used to promote positive development before children enter school, including home visitor programs during infancy and toddlerhood and parent education programs. We focus in this report, however, on strategies that include direct educational services to preschool-age children.

II. Research on the Effects of Early Childhood Education

This section summarizes what we have learned from research related to early childhood education.

- ***Children from low-income families begin school, on average, with substantially poorer cognitive skills than children from middle- and upper-income families.***

Studies have found repeatedly that children from families low in socioeconomic status (SES) begin school, on average, with substantially poorer basic academic skills than more economically advantaged children.[3] A study recently completed in Southern California is one of the more comprehensive accounts of SES differences in young children's preparation for schooling.[4] The study included 262 children who were assessed at the beginning and end of their last year of preschool or kindergarten. The sample was ethnically diverse, about half Latino and about a quarter African-American and a quarter Caucasian. The middle-class children scored substantially higher than their disadvantaged peers on all eight of the cognitive and academic achievement measures used. For four of the eight cognitive tasks, the middle-class preschool children scored higher, on average, than the disadvantaged kindergarten children, indicating that *the low-income children began school more than a year behind middle-income children in cognitive skills.* Other studies have found as much as a year and a half difference between low-income and middle-class children's cognitive skills at the time of school entry.[5]

- ***Children's cognitive skills when they enter school predict fairly well their achievement in high school and their educational attainment.***

Studies show that children's cognitive skills (e.g., school readiness, verbal skills, general cognitive abilities) before they enter school are highly predictive of their achievement in high school[6] and even in early adulthood.[7] Studies have shown further that cognitive skills as early as preschool predict high school completion, presumably in large part because low academic performance in the early grades predicts low academic performance in the later grades, which in turn is associated with dropping out of school.[8]

- ***Low-income children are less likely than middle- and upper-income children to have access to an early childhood education program.***

A number of studies have documented disparities in access to preschool programs associated with income levels. In a recent study, researchers found that in California the opportunity to enroll

children in an early childhood program was largely dependent on a family's income and where they lived. In Los Angeles County, for example, affluent families were twice as likely as parents living in low-income communities to find an open space in an early childhood program.[9]

- ***Early childhood education programs can have both short- and long-term benefits for low-income children.***

Three decades of evaluations of early childhood education programs designed for low-income children have demonstrated definitively that positive effects *can* be achieved. Although the advantages that are seen immediately after the intervention usually diminish over time, many studies have showed sustained effects.[10] The services provided by programs that have been evaluated vary—from preschool education only to preschool education plus a variety of medical and social services, and parenting programs. Consequently, although some health outcomes can be clearly attributed to health components (e.g., vaccinations), for most outcomes it is difficult to identify the program component responsible. Most experts suggest an intervention that combines directly targeting the child and providing parent involvement and education opportunities and education.[11]

The early childhood education programs that have been evaluated fall roughly into two categories: (1) small-scale, often university-affiliated programs, and (2) large-scale federal-, state-, or school-district-funded programs. Generally, there is weaker evidence for the long-term effects of large-scale programs than for small, experimental programs. Most likely the weaker impact is explained by the greater variability in the quality and by the amount of time children spend in large-scale programs.[12]

Small-Scale, Experimental Programs

Best known for its long-term positive effects on children's development is David Weikart's Perry Preschool Program that served 123 three- and four-year-old children. Researchers have followed children who attended this preschool program through age 27. Findings show higher achievement levels in eighth grade, higher high school completion rates, higher employment rates, lower levels of juvenile crime and arrests, and lower rates of teenage pregnancy compared to control children who did not attend the preschool.[13]

The Carolina Abecedarian study is another well-known early childhood education program with strong positive effects.[14] The program was intensive, from infancy to the age of five years, with a full day educational program supplemented with medical and social services and parent education. Follow-up studies of the 57 experimental and 54 control children show that at age 15 years, the children who received the intervention have higher IQs, higher achievement test scores, and a lower likelihood of special education and grade retention than children who did not receive the intervention.

A consortium of 12 early childhood intervention programs was created in the early 1980s to examine, collectively, long-term program effects. The programs varied in the age at which children entered them and the kind of services they provided. On the whole, program graduates were less likely to be assigned to special education classes and less likely to be retained in a grade than were children in

the control groups. In the four programs in which children were old enough to have completed high school, program participants had higher completion rates than control children. These positive effects were found regardless of children's gender, ethnic background, or initial ability level. Program graduates also rated their school performance better, and there was some, albeit relatively weak, evidence for higher achievement levels.[15]

In a comprehensive review of small-scale model programs, Steve Barnett reports that five of 11 studies with achievement test data found significant positive program effects beyond third grade. All 10 studies that reported grade retention and special education rates showed lower rates for the early childhood intervention group; the two studies that followed children long enough to assess graduation rates found higher rates among intervention children.[16]

Large-Scale Programs

The Head Start Synthesis Project, a meta-analysis and review of over 200 studies prior to 1985, concluded that:

> ... children enrolled in Head Start enjoy significant immediate gains in cognitive test scores, socioemotional test scores, and health status. In the long run, cognitive and socioemotional test scores of former Head Start students do not remain superior to those of disadvantaged children who did not attend Head Start. However, a small subset of studies find that former Head Starters are more likely to be promoted to the next grade and are less likely to be assigned to special education classes. [17]

In a more recent review of Head Start evaluations by the General Accounting Office, nearly 600 citations and documents were found. The report was critical of the methodologies used and the conclusions that could be drawn.[18] But despite the difficulties of demonstrating broad and systematic effects of a program as large and varied as Head Start, some of the studies cited showed positive effects.

For example, a study of thousands of sixth through eighth graders who had attended Head Start in 33 programs throughout Philadelphia showed that they had better school adjustment than peers who had no preschool.[19] And in a study of three waves of Head Start graduates (nearly 2,000 children) at the end of high school, the oldest cohort performed better academically than control subjects.[20]

A study comparing Head Start participants in the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) to their siblings found that Head Start was associated with significant gains in cognitive skills and reductions in grade repetition for white students, but the effects of Head Start were not significant for African-American children.[21] Another study, in contrast, found greater cognitive gains accruing to African-American than to white Head Start participants when they were compared to children who had no preschool. African-American children who began with below-average initial ability gained the most.[22] Although program effects were still seen later, when children were in first grade, they were diminished.[23]

Another example of a large-scale program is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a Chapter 1-funded preschool program in the Chicago Public Schools that began in 1967. The preschool programs were integrated into public elementary schools, and provided nutrition and medical check-ups for children as well as parent intervention. Long-term evaluations at sixth grade showed that participants had higher reading and math achievement and were less likely to claim that they got in trouble in school than did no-preschool controls.[24] But intervention children continued to receive special services through the third grade, and the evaluation at age 14 indicates that children who were enrolled in both the preschool and the primary grade components benefited the most.[25]

In Barnett's review of early childhood education program evaluations, program effects on achievement were variable—divided roughly evenly among those that found no initial positive effects, those that found initial effects that faded by third grade, and those that found effects persisting beyond third grade.[26] Lower rates of retention and special education were found for eight of the 10 large-scale programs that collected this data, and the two studies that followed children long enough to assess graduation rates found higher rates among intervention children.

Early Childhood Education for Children with Special Needs

The research evidence strongly supports the benefits of early childhood programs for children with special needs. Programs have been found to reduce developmental delay, the need and costs for school-based services, and the likelihood of institutionalization.[27] Although there is some disagreement, most experts recommend a continuum of quality early childhood placement options—from full inclusion to integrated special education, to special education only.[28]

Summary

In brief, research on the effects of early childhood education indicates that children, on average, benefit in the following ways:[29]

- Higher initial IQs
- Higher academic achievement, which in some cases is sustained several years beyond the intervention
- Lower grade-retention rates in school
- Lower special education placement in school
- Higher graduation rates
- Lower delinquency rates

Programs vary considerably, however, in whether such benefits are seen at all, and whether they persist past a year or two after the intervention. A variety of approaches produce similar effects, but one reviewer of the research concluded that the magnitude of effects is roughly related to the program's intensity, breadth, and amount of involvement with children and their families.[30]

➢ ***Quality counts.***

As one well-known economist put it: 'You get what you pay for. '[81] Two recent national studies of day care provide strong support for the importance of quality. The National Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study has shown that children who had attended higher-quality child care centers had better outcomes through second grade.[32] In particular, higher-quality classroom practices were associated with better cognitive outcomes, more positive teacher-student relationships, better classroom behavior (including attention), and better social skills. Generally, children at greatest risk (those who had mothers with the lowest levels of education) were most affected by program quality.

A national study of day care, being conducted under the auspices of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), has found that children in programs that met the standards recommended by the American Public Health Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics[33] had fewer behavioral problems, better language comprehension, and higher scores on school-readiness tests than children in programs that did not meet the standards. These differences were found even with family variables (e.g., income, and mother ś education and marital status) held constant.

Studies of Head Start have shown that the quality of the program substantially affects children ś outcomes, regardless of the quality or nature of their home environments.[34] Initial data from the FACES study of more than 3,000 children in 40 nationally representative Head Start programs (begun in 1997) show that children scored higher on early literacy measures when they experienced relatively sensitive teachers who encouraged independent interactions and provided rich language learning opportunities and a classroom equipped with learning resources.[35] The National Child Care Staffing Study found, similarly, that children who had more sensitive teachers showed more positive outcomes.

In summary, the following qualities of programs have been associated with positive outcomes for children:

- Overall quality (usually measured by the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale (ECERS)—e.g., curriculum, environment, teacher-child interactions, teaching practices, personal care, furnishings, fine and gross motor activities, etc.[36]
- Language-rich environments
- Sensitive teachers who develop close, supportive relationships with children[37]
- Child-focused communication between school and home[23]

These qualities of preschool programs are associated with the following regulatable variables—relatively:

- teacher education (greater teacher formal education and early childhood education training)[38]
- smaller class sizes and low child/teacher ratios[39]

- lower staff turnover[40]
- higher teacher compensation[41]

Years of teaching tend to be less strongly associated with program quality than teacher education.[42]

Research has also shown the value of integrating specific curriculum or teaching strategies into programs. Whitehurst and his colleagues, for example, integrated an emergent literacy intervention, involving interactive book-reading ('dialogic reading ') and phonemic awareness, into Head Start programs.[43] The effects varied substantially among the participating programs, underscoring the importance of program quality in promoting children ś cognitive skills, but in many cases the curriculum substantially contributed to children ś language and literacy skills.

Studies suggest the quality standards for early childhood education of typically developing children in group settings may be insufficient for young children with special needs. Adaptations in the classroom environment and teaching techniques are often necessary. [44]

➢ ***The nature of the instructional program affects learning and motivation.***

Trends in the nature of early childhood programs designed to promote cognitive skills have moved in two divergent directions in the U.S. in recent years— toward more child-centered approaches or more teacher-directed approaches. The National Association for the Education of Young Children ś (NAEYC) published guidelines for early childhood education have been successful in promoting a very child-centered approach.[45] The guidelines recommend considerable child choice and open-ended opportunities for children to explore concrete materials and to interact with each other. Basic skills are taught, but practitioners are advised to embed them in everyday, meaningful activities (e.g., cooking, reading stories). The guidelines also suggest that teaching be individualized, so that it is appropriate to the skill level of each child.

A minority of researchers, however, endorse a greater emphasis on basic skills using direct teaching approaches.[46] There is some evidence that an increasing number of schools in the U.S., at least at the kindergarten level, are adopting a more didactic, basic skills approach, using commercially prepared curricula that involve many paper-and-pencil tasks.[47] In highly teacher-directed programs children are given fewer choices about what to do and spend relatively more time doing such basic skills tasks as counting, identifying and writing letters, and doing worksheets (e.g., circling pictures of words beginning with a particular letter).

The empirical evidence shows that the basic skills of economically disadvantaged children can be significantly improved in programs that emphasize basic skills.[48] Taken together, however, the evidence does not support a basic skills emphasis over a more child-centered approach. Even for academic outcomes, several studies have shown that children enrolled in more child-centered programs have some advantage over children enrolled in more teacher-directed programs.[49] There is also evidence suggesting negative effects of direct instruction on social-motivational development,[50] stress,[51] and motivation-related beliefs and behaviors (e.g., perceptions of competence, expectations for success, independence, classroom behavior).[52]

➢ ***Childhood Education can help, but it won t erase income differences in child outcomes.***

In the late 1960s, when Head Start and a variety of other early childhood and family intervention programs were created, scholars and policy makers alike were exceedingly optimistic about their benefits. Despite three subsequent decades of research showing generally positive effects, we have learned that early childhood education is not a panacea for the negative effects of poverty on children s development.

As positive as the Perry Preschool Project was, for example, over 30% of the graduates were arrested at least once by the time they were young adults, and one third dropped out of high school. Although studies have shown cognitive advantages of Head Start participants over control children, Head Start participants 'cognitive skills are still substantially below middle-class children s.[53] Similarly, although the Chicago Child-Parent Centers appear to have improved high school graduation rates, the rates still did not even approach national norms.[54]

III. Evaluation of Existing Systems and Programs

Resources for child care and early childhood education include informal 'babysitting, "licensed child care centers, licensed and unlicensed family child care providers, Head Start programs, public school preschool programs, and more. Currently, a formal system that ties the various forms of child care and early childhood education programs together does not exist. Consequently, local programs have to find funds from various sources, manage varying contract and program requirements, and enroll families based on different eligibility requirements. The state system for subsidized child care services and the regulation of licensed facilities is, moreover, entirely separate from and often uncoordinated with early childhood education services, such as the federally-funded Head Start programs. As will be discussed below, the current disarray makes it difficult for agencies, large and small, to merge or blend funds from different sources.

Below is a brief overview of California s licensing standards for child care programs, and the system of subsidized programs administered by the California Department of Education, the California Department of Social Services, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. All of these programs are accessed differently, have different eligibility and enrollment criteria and program and documentation requirements, and are administered on a local level by various entities and nonprofit organizations.

➢ ***Licensing Standards***

In California, there are two types of licenses for child care facilities. The California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division, is the regulatory body responsible for the oversight and monitoring of these facilities.[55]

1) *Child care centers*: 'Typically operated outside the licensee's home. Child care centers provide child care and supervision to infants, toddlers, preschoolers or school-age children.... Depending on its usable indoor space, the number of restrooms and the size of the outdoor play space, centers can care for virtually any number of children. Qualified teachers ... must have completed at least 12 units of Early Childhood Education course work.'[56]

2) *Family Child Care Homes*: 'always operated in the licensee's own home. Family child care homes are in residential settings and provide a home-like environment. Small Family Child Care Homes can care for up to eight children. Large Homes can care for up to 14 children when the care provider has the help of an assistant.'[57]

Adherence to Title 5 of the Education Code of Regulations is required for State Department of Education-subsidized child care and early education programs. Title 5 differs from Title 22 in that it requires that staff obtain Child Development Permits. This permit system establishes additional educational and experience requirements for the various levels of teachers, supervisors and directors. It also requires that these programs comply with state-defined quality indicators and developmentally appropriate practice.

➢ ***Sources and Administration of Funding***

Since 1943, the California Department of Education (CDE) has administered subsidized child care and development programs for qualifying low-income families. As outlined in the California Working Families Project publication, 'Understanding Child Care —A Primer For Policy Makers," CDE activities fall into four categories:

1) Contract administration for child care programs for qualifying low-income families (including certificates/vouchers and child care centers)
2) Contract administration for Stages II and III of CalWORKs[58] child care
3) Contract administration for state preschool programs (half-day programs)
4) Planning, technical assistance to contracting agencies, quality improvement activities, capacity development, and parent support services[59]

According to the California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), the proposed budget for child care funding for Fiscal Year 2000-01 is $2.6 billion.[60] Approximately half of this amount will be spent on child care for former and/or current CalWORKs clients. The proposed budget fully funds the estimated need for child care for CalWORKs clients, in contrast to the limited funding proposed to serve working-poor families who are not enrolled in CalWORKs.

The table below summarizes the various child care programs in California administered by both the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). LAO estimates show that approximately 383,000 children receive full-time subsidized child care services and another 198,000 participate in part-time preschool or after-school programs.[61] In

addition to these sources of funding for early childhood education and care, there are federal and state funds for children with special needs under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Program	Estimated Enrollment	Governor's Budget (in millions)
Full-Time Programs		
CalWORKs	249,500	1,314.9
General Child Care	70,000	463.5
Alternate Payment Programs	35,000	194.3
Stage 3 for working poor[62]	10,000	56.9
Migrant and Latch Key Programs	13,000	140.8
CalSAFE[63]	5,000	37.2
Part-Time Programs		
State pre-school	100,500	253.7
After-school programs	97,500	87.8

'On The Capitol Doorstep "provides a comprehensive overview and description of California Child Care and Preschool Programs offered through the California Department of Education, California Department of Social Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children and Families Head Start Programs, Federal Child Care and Development Fund, State-Legislated After-school Funds, and other funded child care programs. Copies of the overview can be obtained by calling 'On The Capitol Doorstep "at (916) 442-5431.

IV. Integrating and Coordinating Systems and Programs

A review of the history of child care in California, conducted in 1998, documents changes in the underlying philosophies about who was to be served, in the nature and availability of services, and in the funding, administration, regulation, and quality of child care and development services throughout the twentieth century.[64] The convergence of three social factors make the present a particularly auspicious time for rethinking the current state of child care and early childhood education:

1) public recognition that early brain development and environmental factors influence learning and developmental trajectories;
2) greater awareness that child care is necessary for parents to work; and
3) welfare reform policies that have brought into clear relief the limits of the currently disjointed, informal system of child care.

In recent years, many local efforts, legislative mandates and funds have focused on restructuring the child care and early childhood education system to be a coordinated and seamless one for parents and professionals. Collaboration and coordination of resources are increasingly emphasized in programs and funding streams.

Local efforts demonstrate the power of collaboration and the possibilities for creating a user-friendly child care infrastructure. Below are two examples:

The Hathaway Family Resource Center, in the northeast area of Los Angeles County, strives to serve as a collaborative partner with other social service providers, educators, and religious and government agencies to provide a variety of programs to families— including child care services, subsidies, training and parenting information. Hathaway was one of the founding organizations responsible for forming the Northeast Community Resource Coordinating Council. Forty-six organizations are now involved in the Council. Their mission is to coordinate existing services and efforts in the northeast area of Los Angeles and to bring new funding to their community. As a result of this successful collaboration, Hathaway has received a number of grants to serve as the lead agency to provide the following:

Success By Six: (*in collaboration with Child and Family Services, the Latino Family Child Care Association, Highlands Preschool, Los Angeles Unified School District, and Pacific Oaks College*) This new initiative is focused on children from the prenatal stage to age six. It is focused on family literacy, quality child care and parent education and is funded by the United Way of Greater Los Angeles. The initiative presents a tremendous opportunity to expand outreach efforts to child care providers and parents.

Youth Councils: (*in collaboration with Eagle Rock High School, Franklin High School, Chinatown Service Center and Barrio Action*) This program engages youth throughout the northeast community and teaches them leadership skills that they can use to improve their neighborhoods. The County of Los Angeles Family Support Program funds this activity.

L.A. Bridges: (*in collaboration with Soledad Enrichment Action, El Centro del Pueblo, Occidental College and L.A. Team Mentoring*) This program is a gang prevention and intervention project that provides after-school care, summer activities programs, parent education, and an arts/drama program for school-aged children. The City of Los Angeles funds this collaboration.

Promotoras Comunitarias: (*in collaboration with Planned Parenthood*) This is an outreach educational program that empowers Latinas and their families to become community health educators offering classes in the community and in schools. Promotoras is funded by a number of sources, including the County of Los Angeles and United Way of Greater Los Angeles.

Family Child Care Provider Network: (*in collaboration with Highlands Preschool and Pacific Oaks College*) The Center is the site for organizing a child care provider's network to assist in providing ongoing training and support for neighborhood providers.[65]

For more information, contact Pat Bowie, Executive Director of Hathaway Family Resource Center, at (323) 257-8118.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contra Costa County has merged federal and state children's programs and is the "only county-government entity in California that provides state-subsidized child care and development and federal Head Start programs in directly operated centers."[66] As a result of welfare reform and the need for additional and increased services, Contra Costa County's Community Services Department (CSD) sought to develop a full-day, full-year program to meet the changing needs of families and their children. In 1998, after receiving permission from the California Department of Education and the Federal Administration for Children and Families, a pilot program was developed. Using a "crisscross" model, children spent one part of each day in a Head Start classroom and the other in a CDE-funded child care classroom. This proved to have administrative benefits, but did not support continuity of care and was confusing to both parents and staff. After additional pilot projects, Head Start and CDE-funded Child Development programs have been merged into one division: the Family and Children's Services Division. "Under one administration, the program is gradually folding eligible part-day Head Start and full-day Child Development children into a common unit called 'Child Start.' Child Start will adhere to the higher standard of either federal Head Start or state-funded child care and development programs... In subsequent stages of the merger, Child Start will grow larger and Child Development and part-day Head Start will grow smaller. There will always be a need for some strictly Head Start and State Preschool half-day slots. Therefore, not all slots will be converted to the full-day model."[67]
For more information about this and other Head Start collaborations throughout California, contact Michael Zito, Coordinator of the California Head Start-State Collaboration Office, Child Development Division of the California Department of Education, at (916) 323-9727.

Key to the success of these coordinated systems are the leadership of the organizations and their funding sources, and their common understanding and commitment to shared decision making, community organizing and building, and flexible allocation of resources. As Davisson, Manager of Family and Children Services in Contra Costa County, explains, "Having leaders with a vision and willingness to invest the time and resources to 'sell' the vision to a critical mass of stakeholders leads to successful collaborations that work better for children and families."[68]

V. Integrating and Coordinating Funding

Extant funds, as described above, are limited in their scope in that they only support early childhood education and child care for families living in poverty or at risk of abuse and neglect. Over the years, "child care has been regarded largely as a marginal child welfare service. It was seen as an adjunct to welfare to enable families to work and get off welfare."[69] The current state of funding for early childhood education in California promotes segregation by isolating children who come from very poor families.

Proposition 10 provides us with a golden opportunity to look beyond our current funding disarray to create a unified, coordinated system of child care and development services for all families. It can lay the groundwork for universal preschool, bringing quality early childhood education to all children, not just to those families that fit the narrow eligibility requirements of current federal and state-funded programs.

Blending Federal Head Start and state-funded programs still segregates poor and middle-class children, but it is a modest beginning to laying the foundation for universal access to child care and development services. As in the Contra Costa Head Start/State Preschool model described above, the melding of Federal Head Start and California Department of Education child care resources,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

while challenging, provides opportunities to bring family resources, quality early childhood experiences, greater staff support, and increased salaries to local community-based early childhood programs. Issues of income eligibility, contract requirements, conflicting philosophies, staffing requirements, fiscal oversight, and administrative structures make the blending of these two funding sources difficult. Changes to the California Education Code and Federal Head Start regulations that diminish these differences would greatly assist providers in creating partnerships to blend funds.

Until these regulations are changed, Proposition 10 funds could be used to fill the gaps that exist when the two funds are blended. For instance, Proposition 10 funding could be used to support those activities whose absence often creates barriers to Head Start/CDE partnerships:

1) **Attorneys**: To develop interagency contracts for the various partners that meet the requirements of funding sources.
2) **Facilities/Real Estate**: Experts in facilities financing and real estate to locate and help broker financing; architects to offer design expertise; general contractors; building maintenance.
3) **Human Resources**: To help resolve personnel/staffing differences required in various contracts.
4) **Start-up Funding**: Although CDE and Head Start funds include start-up allowances for new programs, these allowances are often not adequate to cover all expenses.
5) **Information Systems**: Set up databases based on individual contract requirements so that contract/fiscal monitoring and reporting is streamlined and easy to maintain.
6) **Evaluation/Assessment**: To assist in establishing systems for evaluation and assessment that meet all contract requirements.
7) **Finance**: To assist in setting up finance and accounting systems that are based on various contract reporting requirements.

Resources to help design programs that integrate different funding streams are already available. For example, the Head Start Bureau, the Child Care Bureau, and the Administration for Children and Families, in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, has funded a training and technical assistance project called 'Quality in Linking Together (QUILT)." "The project's goal is to foster and support partnerships among child care, Head Start, pre-kindergarten, and other early education programs to increase the availability of quality, comprehensive, full-day/full-year care for children. "[70] QUILT training and technical assistance services are available to those organizations that might not be familiar with specific funded program requirements, but are looking to blend Proposition 10, Head Start, and California Department of Education funding.

Proposition 10 revenue generated from the tobacco surtax is to be allocated based on the percentage of live births recorded in each county in proportion to the entire number of live births recorded in the state. In some counties, this percentage would not produce enough funds to carry out the mandate of the initiative effectively. As a result, a baseline funding of $200,000 was established by the California Commission for Children and Families. Eight of the 58 counties (14%) in California

received an augmentation, varying from $1,459 to $192,685, to bring their Proposition 10 funding up to this baseline amount. Funding across the 58 counties for 1999/2000 range from the baseline amount of $200,000 to $169 million.

This funding breakdown described above reflects the diversity of each county and the specific barriers and challenges facing Proposition 10 commissioners. Geography (e.g., mountains, road access, size of county), resources for children's services, and population trends are all important factors in the planning of early education services to be funded under Proposition 10. Recommendations for funding must be made based on the individual county and the resources and services that are available. County Commissions have an opportunity to both respect and recognize the families and resources in their counties and to support programs that are age-appropriate, culturally appropriate, and individually appropriate for each child.

VI. Recommendations

We have attempted to provide a guide that offers an overview of the systems and structures currently in place for early childhood education in California. Because California's population is diverse, and recognizing the number of community-specific issues and concerns, we do not propose specific activities beyond the suggestions made above to assist blending of funding streams. Instead, we offer the following guidelines for commissioners looking to implement quality early childhood education that will promote positive development in children:

- ✓ Give priority to meeting the needs of children at risk for abuse and neglect and those living in poverty.
- ✓ Put into place mechanisms (e.g., regular program evaluation, technical assistance, access to research-based information about best practices) that will promote high-quality child care and educational programs.
- ✓ Increase compensation and fund other initiatives that promote a stable workforce of well-qualified and trained caregivers and teachers.
- ✓ Strengthen those systems promoting professionalism in early childhood education.
- ✓ Promote the implementation of practices that research suggests are effective for children with disabilities and English language learners, with special attention to training and resources needed to meet their needs.
- ✓ Work to develop a foundation for quality child care and development services for all families, and a system that does not isolate and stigmatize economically disadvantaged families. Lay the groundwork for universal access to quality early childhood education.

- ✓ Support statewide efforts to inform parents about the benefits and importance of good-quality early childhood experiences. Take advantage of local strengths and efforts to inform and organize parents around quality child care and development issues.

- ✓ Include parents and other community residents in the planning and evaluation of new programs.

- ✓ Support the efforts of local Head Start and CDE-funded agencies as they chart their course for a collaborative partnership that maximizes their specific funding streams and, most importantly, provides better access to families.

VII. Appendix A: Informational Resources

The following list of organizations represents a limited sample of the resources available to provide information about early childhood education programs and services. Organizations listed below may offer referrals to local experts and resources.

Proposition 10 Technical Assistance Center
1-877-TAPROP10 (toll free)
The Technical Assistance Center offers:

1) direct technical assistance to County Commissions by expert consultants. Services will focus on topics and issues pertinent to each commission, based upon the stage of their strategic planning efforts and their unique needs and priorities;
2) information clearinghouse to provide County Commissions with background materials, documents and other relevant information associated with implementation of Proposition 10;
3) program-related and policy-related materials on a range of topics associated with improving the health and development of young children.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
1509 16th St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 232-8777 or (800) 424-2460
Fax: (202) 328-1846
www.naeyc.org
Email: naeyc@naeyc.org
The purpose of NAEYC is to serve and act on behalf of the needs and rights of young children, with a primary focus on the provision of educational services and resources to adults who work with and for children, birth through age eight years.

California Association for the Education of Young Children (CAEYC)
P.O. Box 160373
Sacramento, CA 96816
Telephone: (916) 442-4703
Fax: (916) 442-8053
www.caeyc.org
Email: info@caeyc.org
Staff Members to Contact
Linda Janssen: ljanssen@caeyc.org
Pat Phipps: pphipps@caeyc.org
Carol Danaher: cdanaher@caeyc.org
CAEYC is one of the more than 430 active affiliate groups of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). CAEYC sponsors an annual state conference, bringing together more than 50 chapters of regional associations, and is the primary sponsor of the Annual Public Policy Symposium. It has over 10,000 members in 9 sections, and over 50 chapters.

National Institute on Early Childhood Development and Education (ECI)
Department of Education
Director: Naomi Karp
1319 F St. N.W.
Suite 810
Washington, DC 20004-1106
Telephone: (202) 393-5501
Fax: (202) 393-1109

Head Start Bureau
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
www2.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/hsb

California Head Start Collaboration Office
Coordinator: Michael Zito
California Department of Education
Head Start Collaboration Office
560 J Street, Suite 220
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 323-9727
www.cde.ca.gov
Email: mzito@cde.ca.gov

California Department of Education
Second Floor
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 94244-2720
Telephone: (916) 657-2682
www.cde.ca.gov/iasa
Email: dholt@cde.ca.gov

Children's Defense Fund
(maintains state-by-state data)
25 E. Street NW
Washington DC 20001
Telephone: (202) 662-3652
www.childrensdefense.org

Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study
www.fpg.unc.edu
The study is a longitudinal, national study of day care, assessing the effect of various aspects of quality on child outcomes.

High Scope
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, MI 48198-2898
Telephone: (734) 485-2000
Fax: (734) 485-0704
www.highscope.org
Email: info@highscope.org

California Child Care Resource and Referral Network
111 New Montgomery Street
San Francisco CA 94105
Office: (415) 882-0234
Fax: (415) 882-6233
Email: info@rrnetwork.org
www.rrnetwork.org
The California Child Care Resource and Referral Network (Network) coordinates services that assist local child care resource and referral (RandR) agencies in providing child care information and services to parents, child care providers, policymakers, and business and community leaders in every county in the state.

Policy Analysis for California Education
www-gse.Berkeley.edu/research/PACE
Email: PACE123@socrates.berkeley.edu
Directors
Bruce Fuller: b_fuller@uclink4.berkeley.edu
Gerald C. Hayward: hayward@ns.net
Michael W. Kirst: mwk@leland.stanford.edu

- University of California, Berkeley
  School of Education
  3653 Tolman Hall
  Berkeley, CA 94720-1670
  (510) 642-7223
  (510) 642-9148
  Berkeley Staff
  Gretchen Caspary, Assistant Director: caspary@uclink4.berkeley.edu
  Elizabeth Burr, Research Coordinator: elizburr@uclink4.berkeley.edu
  Diana L. Smith, Office Manager: dlsmith@uclink4.berkeley.edu
  Regina Burley, Administrative Asst.: rbb@uclink4.berkeley.edu
- Stanford University
  School of Education
  485 Lasuen Hall
  Stanford, CA 94305-3096
  (650) 725-1235
  (650) 725-7412 Fax
  Stanford Staff
  Terry Alter, Office Manager: talter@leland.stanford.edu

- Sacramento Office
  1130 K Street
  Suite 210
  Sacramento, CA 95814
  (916) 441-5062
  (916) 441-1866 Fax
  Sacramento Staff
  Robert Dillman, Office Manager: robertdill@uclink4.berkeley.edu

Founded in 1983 as a cooperative venture between the schools of education at UC Berkeley and Stanford University, PACE is an independent policy research center whose primary aim is to enrich education policy debates with sound analysis and hard evidence. PACE provides analysis and assistance to California policymakers, education professionals, and the general public.

Child Development Policy Advisory Committee
915 Capitol Mall, Room 336
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-3725
(916) 446-9643 FAX
Email: cdpac@ix.netcom.com
www.cdpac.ca.gov
The Child Development Policy Advisory Committee is a citizens 'review board comprised of appointed members—parents, members of the public, family child care providers, and child care center providers—and representatives of five state departments. The Committee meets monthly and operates through public forums. The Committee regularly publishes information regarding child care issues.

California Department of Social Services
744 P Street
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 657-3667
For general public inquiries, contact (916) 657-3661
For media inquiries contact (916) 657-2268
www.dss.cahwnet.gov
The California Department of Social Services is designed to protect needy and vulnerable children and adults. The Department has 4,200 employees located in 51 offices throughout the state, the 58 county welfare departments, the 58 county district attorney offices and a host of community-based organizations.

National Economic Development and Law Center
Child care facilities development and financing
www.nedlc.org

National Economic Development and Law Center
2201 Broadway, Suite 815
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: (510) 251-2600
Fax: (510) 251-0600
www.nedlc.org
The NEDLC is a non-profit public interest law and planning organization that specializes in community economic development. It works in collaboration with community organizations, private foundations, corporations and government agencies to build the human, social, and economic capacities of low-income communities and their residents. They design and implement demonstration projects in job creation and employment, training, workforce development, and income enhancement.

Children Now
• Main Office
1212 Broadway, 5th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (510) 763-2444
Fax: (510) 763-1974
Email: children@childrennow.org
• Los Angeles Office
2001 South Barrington Ave, Suite 100
Los Angeles, CA 90025
Telephone: (310) 268-2444
Fax: (310) 268-1994
Email: cnla@earthlink.net
• New York Office
355 Lexington Ave, 11th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 682-1896
Fax: (212) 682-3222
Email: children@inch.com
www.childrennow.org
Children Now provides policy expertise and up-to-date information on the status of children. It uses communications strategies to reach parents, lawmakers, citizens, business, media and community leaders, to create attention and generate positive change on behalf of children.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Headquarters: Hubert H. Humphrey Building
200 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, D.C., 20201
www.hhs.gov
Within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), which is responsible for some 60 programs that promote the economic and social well-being of families, children, individuals and communities—including Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), the national child support enforcement system, Head Start, foster care and adoption assistance and programs to prevent child abuse and domestic violence.

California Women's Law Center
3460 Wilshire Blvd.,
Suite 1102
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Telephone: 213.637.9900
Fax: 213.637.9909
E-mail: cwlc@cwlc.org
www.cwlc.org
The CWLC is dedicated solely to addressing the comprehensive legal concerns of women and girls on issues of sex discrimination, violence against women, family law, child care, and women's health and reproductive rights.

Child Development Training Consortium
1620 North Carpenter Road, Suite C-12
Modesto, CA 95351
Fax: (209)-572-1587
For general information, contact Kimberly Baker at (209) 572-6080
www.childdevelopment.org
The Child Development Training Consortium is a statewide program funded by the California Department of Education, Child Development Division (CDE/CDD) with Federal Block Grant Child Care and Development Quality Improvement Funds. The CDTC is one of 15 quality improvement projects funded by CDE/CDD. The program is administered by the Yosemite Community College District. The CDTC provides to eligible participants:

1) Community College Reimbursement Program through 81 participating community colleges. Access to this service is available through the Campus Coordinator designated at each campus.
2) Career Incentive Grants for:
   a) Employees of child care/development programs funded by the California Department of Education, Child Development Division (CDE/CDD) who do not attend a Consortium campus or
   b) Staff of child care/development programs, including family child care who are taking course work at a four-year college or university or
   c) Staff of programs funded by CDE/CDD who are working under a Supervision Permit Waiver issued by CDD.
3) Child Development Permit Stipends pay the application processing fees to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing for Child Development Permits.
4) Administrator Institutes conducted throughout the state to support the professional growth and development of program directors and site supervisors.

California Early Childhood Mentor Program
Peyton Nattinger, Mentor Program Director
Email: pnattinger@yahoo.com
Linda Olivenbaum, Mentor Program Coordinator
Email: LOlivenbaum@clpccd.cc.ca.us
Susan Affleck, Mentor Program Clerk
Email: SAffleck@clpccd.cc.ca.us
Lori Day, Mentor Secretary
Email: LDay@clpccd.cc.ca.us
www.clpccd.cc.ca.us/mentor
The California Early Childhood Mentor Program provides advanced training for experienced child care workers who wish to become mentors to new practitioners. Selection is based on professional qualifications and a quality review of the candidate's classroom. Those who are selected as mentors are paid stipends for continuing in-service training, and for the supervision of student teachers who are assigned to the mentors' classrooms.

WestEd
730 Harrison Street
San Francisco CA 94107-1242
(415) 565-3000
www.WestEd.org
WestEd is a nonprofit research, development and service agency dedicated to improving education and other opportunities for children, youth and adults. Staff work with practitioners and policymakers to address critical issues in education, including early childhood intervention.

California Department of Housing and Community Development, Child Care Facilities Financing Program
www.hcd.ca.gov/ca/ccffp
The program provides loan guarantees and direct loans for the development and/or expansion of child care facilities, child development facilities, and family child care homes.

California Tomorrow
www.californiatomorrow.org
California Tomorrow is a nonprofit organization dedicated to contributing to the building of a strong and fair multiracial, multicultural, multilingual society that is equitable for everyone.

QUILT (Quality in Linking Together) Head Start-Child Care Partnerships
www.quilt.org
(877) 867-8458

VIII. Appendix B: Expert Individual Contacts

NOTE: This list of experts is extremely limited and is included for informational purposes only. All possess expertise in the field of early childhood education. Expertise in the field is not limited to the list of individuals identified below. This listing of individual contacts is provided as a resource to the reader.

Pat Dorman
Publisher
On the Capitol Doorstep
926 J Street, Suite 1007
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.tomatoweb.com/capdoor/
Phone: (916) 442-5431
Fax: (916) 442-1035
(*On the Capitol Doorstep is an independent monthly report on public policy issues affecting young children in California.*)

Bruce Fuller, Ph.D.
Director
Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE)
UC Berkeley
School of Education
3653 Tolman Hall
Berkeley, CA 97420-1670
Email: b_fuller@uclink4.berkeley.edu
Phone: (510) 642-7223
Fax: (510) 642-9148

Jack Hailey
Staff Director
California Senate Office of Research
1020 N Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-1727
Fax: (916) 324-3944
jack.hailey@sen.ca.gov

Gerald Hayward, Ph.D.
Director
Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE)
UC Berkeley
School of Education
3653 Tolman Hall
Berkeley, CA 97420-1670
hayward@ns.net
Phone: (510) 642-7223
Fax: (510) 642-9148

Karen Hill Scott, Ed.D.
President
Karen Hill Scott and Associates
6175 Wooster Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90056
Phone: (310) 216-2928
Fax: (310) 216-2929

Elizabeth Hiteshew
Past President
California Association for the Education of Young Children
1127-A 22nd Street
Santa Monica, California 90403
Phone: (310) 453-1147
Fax: (310) 829-6898

Carollee Howes
Graduate School of Education and Information Studies
Moore Hall, Box 951521
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521
Phone: (310) 825-8336
howes@gseis.ucla.edu

Jacqueline McCroskey
Associate Professor
School of Social Work
University of Southern California
MRF 345
Los Angeles, CA 90089
Mccroske@usc.edu
Phone: (213) 740-2004
Fax: (213) 740-0789

Patty Siegel
Executive Director
California Child Care Resource and Referral Network
111 New Montgomery Street
7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415) 882-0234
Fax: (415) 882-6233
Info@rrnetwork.org

Alice Walker-Duff, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Crystal Stairs, Inc.
5200 West Century Boulevard
Suite 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Phone: (323) 299-8998
Fax: (323) 295-9095

Sharon Watson
Commissioner, City of Los Angeles
Commission for Children, Youth and Their Families
333 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Phone: (213) 485-3821
Fax: (213) 485-5439

Vivian Weinstein
President
City of Los Angeles
Commission for Children, Youth and Their Families
333 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Phone: (213) 485-3821
Fax: (213) 485-5439

IX. Bibliography

Barnett, W. S. (1995). Long-term effects of early childhood programs on cognitive and school outcomes. The Future of Children,5, 35-50.

Barnett, W., Young, J., and Schweinhart, L. (1998). How preschool education influences long-term cognitive development and school success. In S. Barnett and S. Boocock (Ed.), Early care and education for children in poverty (167-184). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Baydar, N., Brooks-Gunn, J., and Furstenberg, F. (1993). Early warning signs of functional illiteracy: Predictors in childhood and adolescence. Child Development, 64, 815-829.

Becker, W., and Gersten, R. (1982). A follow-up of Follow Through: The later effects of the Direct Instruction Model on children in fifth and sixth grades. American Educational Research Journal, I 9, 75-92.

Bereiter, C. (1986). Does direct instruction cause delinquency? Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 1, 289-292.

Berk, L. (1985). Relationship of educational attainment, child-oriented attitudes, job satisfaction, and career commitment to caregiver behavior toward children. Child Care Quarterly, I 4, 103-129.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.). (1989). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bredekamp, S., and Copple, C. (Ed.). (1997). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs (revised. ed.). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bredekamp, S., and Rosegrant, T. (Eds) (1992). Reaching potentials: Appropriate curriculum and assessment for young children, Vol 1. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bredekamp, S., and Rosegrant, T. (Eds) (1995). Reaching potentials: Transforming early childhood curriculum and assessment, Vol 2. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Guo, G., and Furstenberg, F. (1993). Who drops out of and who continues beyond high school? A 20-year follow-up of black urban youth. Journal of Research on Adolescence,3, 271-294.

Bryant, D., Burchinal, M., Lau, L. and Sparling, J. (1994). Family and classroom correlates of Head Start children's developmental outcomes. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 9, 289-309.

Bryant, D., Peisner, E., and Clifford, R. (1993). Evaluation of public preschool programs in North Carolina. NC: Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center.

Bryant, D., Clifford, R., and Peisner, E. (1991). Best practices for beginners: Developmental appropriateness in kindergarten. American Educational Research Journal,2 8, 783-803.

Bryant, D., Peisner-Feinberg, E., and Clifford, R. (1993). Evaluation of public preschool programs in North Carolina. Chapel Hill, NC: Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center.

Burts, D., Hart, C., Charlesworth, R., Fleege, P., Mosley, J, and Thomasson, R. (1992). Observed activities and stress behaviors of children in developmentally appropriate and inappropriate kindergarten classrooms. Early Childhood Research Quarterly,7, 297-318.

Burts, D., Hart, C., Charlesworth, R., and Kirk, L. (1990). A comparison of frequencies of stress behaviors observed in kindergarten children in classrooms with developmentally appropriate versus developmentally inappropriate instructional practices. Early Childhood Research Quarterly,5, 407-423.

Buysse, V., Wesley, P.W., Bryant, D. and Garner, D. (1999) Quality of early childhood programs in inclusive and noninclusive settings. *Exceptional Children*, 65, 3, 301-314.

California Children and Families Initiative. (September 9, 1999). The California Children and Families State Commission Draft Guidelines. Sacramento, CA: California Children and Families State Commission.

California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division. (June, 1999). Innovations in Child Care – A Handbook of Child Care Innovations and Resources. Sacramento, CA: State of California, Department of Social Services.

California Legislative Analyst's Office. (March 27, 2000). Analysis of the 2000-01 Budget Bill. http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2000/health_ss/hss_3_cc_child_care_an100.htm.

Campbell, F., and Ramey, C. (1994). Effects of early intervention on intellectual and academic achievement: A follow-up study of children from low-income families. Child Development, 65, 684-98.

Carnine, D., Carnine, L., Karp, J., and Weisberg, P. (1988). Kindergarten for economically disadvantaged children: The direct instruction component. In C. Warger (Ed.), A resource guide to public school early childhood programs (pp. 73-98). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Case, R., Griffin, S., and Kelly, W. (1999). Socioeconomic gradients in mathematical ability and their responsiveness to intervention during early childhood. In D. Keating and C. Hertzman (Eds.), Developmental health and the wealth of nations (pp. 125-149). New York: The Guilford Press.

Charlesworth, R., Hart, C., Burts, D., and DeWolf, M. (1993). The LSU studies: Building a research base for developmentally appropriate practice. In S. Reifel (Ed.), Advances in early education and day care. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cohen, R. (October, 1999). Who Will Care for the Children? Unity: A Publication of Community Housing Services Inc. Pasadena, CA.

Copple, C., Cline, M., and Smith, A. (1987). Paths to the future: Long-term effects of Head Start in the Philadelphia school district. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The Cost and Quality Team (1995). Cost, quality, and child outcomes in child care centers: Executive summary. Denver: University of Colorado at Denver.

The Cost and Quality Team (1999). Children of the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study Go to School. Executive summary.

Currie, J., and Thomas, D. (1995). Does Head Start make a difference? The American Economic Review,8 5, 341-364.

Davisson, W. (Fall, 1999). Head Start-Child Care Partnerships —Merging Federal and State Children ś Programs in Contra Costa County. Bridges —California Head Start-State Collaboration Office,4 (2), 12.

DeVries, R., Reese-Learned, H., and Morgan, P. (1991). Sociomoral development in direct-instruction, constructivist, and eclectic kindergarten programs: A study of children's enacted interpersonal understanding. Early Childhood Research Quarterly,6 , 449-471.

Durkin, D. (1987). A classroom-observation study of reading instruction in kindergarten. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 2, 275-300.

Educational Research Service (1986). Kindergarten programs and practices in public schools. Arlington, VA

Entwisle, D., and Alexander, K. (1990). Beginning school math competence: Minority and majority comparisons. Child Development,6 1, 454-471.

Entwisle, D., Alexander, K., Cadigan, D., and Pallas, A. (1987). Kindergarten experience: Cognitive effects or socialization? American Educational Research Journal,2 4, 337-364.

Frede, E. (1995). The role of program quality in producing early childhood program benefits. The Future of Children, 5, 115-132.

Fuerst, J., and Fuerst, D. (1993). Chicago experience with an early childhood program: The special case of the Child-Parent Center program. Urban Education, 28, 69-96.

Fuller, B., Coonerty, C., Kipnis, F., and Choong, Y. (1997). An Unfair Head Start: California Families Face Gaps in Preschool and Child Care Availability. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley-Stanford PACE Center.

General Accounting Office (GAO, 1997), Head Start: Research Provides Little Information on Impact of Current Program (Gao/HEHS-97-59, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gersten, R., Darch, C., and Gleason, M. (1988). Effectiveness of a direct instruction academic kindergarten for low-income students. The Elementary School Journal, 89, 227-240.

Gersten, R. (1986). Response to 'Consequences of three preschool curriculum models through age 15. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 1, 293-302.

Hathaway Family Resource Center Informational Brochure (1999). 840 North Avenue 66, Los Angeles, CA 90042.

Heckman, J. (1999). Policies to foster human capital. National Bureau of Economic Research. Working Paper 7288. http//www.nber.org/papers/w7288.

Hebbeler, K. (1985). An old and a new question on the effects of early childhood education for children from low-income families. Educational Evaluation and Policy analysis, 7, 207-216.

Hiebert, E. (1988). The role of literacy experiences in early childhood programs. The Elementary School Journal, 89, 161-171.

Howes, C. (1983). Caregiver behavior in center and family day care. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 4, 99-107.

Kagan, S. (1992). Implementing programs and policies for young children and their families: Who is responsible? In J. Johnston and K. Borman (1992). Effective schooling for economically disadvantaged students: School-based strategies for diverse student populations (pp. 29-47). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing.

Karoly, L. et al. (1998). Investing in our children: What we know and don t know about the costs and benefits of early childhood interventions. Santa Monica CA: RAND.

Karpilow, K. (February, 1999). Understanding Child Care —A Primer for Policy Makers. Sacramento, CA: California Working Families Project, A partnership of the California Commission on the Status of Women and the Institute for Research on Women and Families.

Kinder, D. and Carnine, D. (1991). Direct instruction: What it is and what it is becoming. Journal of Behavioral Education, 1, 193-213.

Klabin, K. (November, 1999). First Steps: A look at Child Care Services Under Welfare Reform in Los Angeles County. Los Angeles, CA: Human Services Network of Los Angeles.

Lazar, I. and Darlington, R. (1982). Lasting effects of early education: A report from the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 47 (nos 2-3).

Layzer, J., Goodson, B., and Moss, M. (1993). Observation Study of Early Childhood Programs, Final Report, Volume 1: Life in Preschool. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Lee, V., Brooks-Gunn, J. and Schnur, E. (1988). Does Head Start Work? A 1-year follow-up comparison of disadvantaged children attending Head Start, no preschool, and other preschool programs. Developmental Psychology, 24, 210-222.

Lee, V., Brooks-Gunn, J. and Schnur, E., and Liaw, F. (1990). Are Head Start effects sustained? A longitudinal follow-up comparison of disadvantaged children attending Head Start, no preschool, and other preschool programs. Child Development,6 1, 495-507.

Love, J., Ryer, P., and Faddis, B. Caring environments: Program Quality in California § Publicly Funded Child Development Programs: Report on the Legislatively Mandated 1990-02 Staff/Child Ratio Study. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Luster, T., and McAdoo, H. (1996). Family and child influences on educational attainment: A secondary analysis of the High-Scope Perry Preschool data. Developmental Psychology,3 2, 26-39.

McKey, R., Condelli, L., Ganson, H., Barrett, B., McConkey, C., and Plantz, M. (1985). The impact of Head Start on children, family, and communities: Final report of the Head Start Evaluation, Synthesis and Utilization Project (DHHS Publication No. OHDS 85-31193).

Marcon, R. (1993). Socioemotional versus academic emphasis: Impact on kindergarteners 'development and achievement. Early Child Development and Care, 96, 81-91.

Meyer, L., Gersten, R., and Gutkin, J. (1983). Direct instruction: A project follow through success story in an inner-city school. Elementary School Journal,8 4,2 41-252.

Miller, L., and Bizzell, R. (1983). Long-term effects of four preschool programs: Sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. Child Development,5 4, 727-741.

Mills, E. P., Cole, K., Jenkins, J. and Dale, P. (1998). Effects of differing levels of inclusion on preschoolers with disabilities. Exceptioanal Children,6 5, 79-90.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (1999). Child outcome when child care center classes meet recommended standards for quality. American Journal of Public Health,8 9, 1072-1077.

Phillips Tebb, K. (1998). Thoughtful Reflections for Future Directions: The Los Angeles County Child Care Oral History. Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Child Care Advisory Board.

Ramey, C., Brant, D., and Suarez, T. (1985). Preschool compensatory education and the modifiability of intelligence: A critical review. In D. Detterman (Ed.), Current topics in human intelligence (pp. 247-96). Orwood, NJ: Ablex.

Reynolds, A (1992). Mediated effects of preschool intervention. Early Education and Development, 3, 139-164.

Reynolds, A. (1994). Effects of a preschool plus follow-on intervention for children at risk. Developmental Psychology, 30, 787-804.

Reynolds, A., Mehana, M., and Temple, J. (1995). Does preschool intervention affect children § perceived competence? Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, I 6, 211-230.

Ruopp, R., Travers, J., Glantz, F., and Coelen, C. (1979). Children at the center: Summary findings and their implications. Final report of the National Day Care Study,V ol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Seppanen, P., Godin, K., Metzher, J., et al. (1993). Final report, Volume II: Observational study of Chapter 1— funded early childhood programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Shepard, L., and Smith, M. (1988). Escalating academic demand in kindergarten: Counterproductive policies. The Elementary School Journal,8 9, 135-145.

Stevenson, H., and Newman, R. (1986). Long-term prediction of achievement and attitudes in mathematics and reading. Child Development,5 7, 646-659.

Stipek, D., Feiler, R., Daniels, D., and Milburn, S. (1995). Effects of different instructional approaches on young children's achievement and motivation. Child Development,66, 209-223.

Stipek, D., Feiler, R., Byler, P., Ryan, R., Milburn, S., and Salmon, S. (1998). Good beginnings: What difference does the program make in preparing young children for school? Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 19, 41-66.

Stipek, D., and Ryan, R. (1997). Economically disadvantaged preschoolers: Ready to learn but further to go. Developmental Psychology,33, 711-723.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1998). Second Progress Report, Research, Demonstration and Evaluation Branch and the Head Start Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families. Washington DC.

Walsh, D. (1989). Changes in kindergarten: Why here? Why now? Early Childhood Research Quarterly,4, 377-391.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C., and Phillips, D. (1989). Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America. Final report of the National Child Care Staffing Study. Oakland, CA: Child Care Employee Report.

Whitehurst, G., Zevenbergen, A., Crone, D., Schultz, M., Velting, O., Fischel, J. (1999). Outcomes of an emergent literacy intervention from Head Start through second grade. Journal of Educational Psychology,91, 261-272.

Wolery, M. and Bredekamp, S. (1994). Developmentally appropriate practice and young children with special needs: Contextual issues in the discussion. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 18, 331-341.

Wolery, M., Strain, P.S. and Bailey, D. B (1992). Reaching the potentials of children with special needs. In S. Bredekamp and T. Rosengrant (Eds.), Reaching potentials: Appropriate curriculum and assessment for young children (pp. 92-111). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Woodhead, M. (1988). When psychology informs public policy: The case of early childhood intervention. American Psychologist, 43, 443-454.

X. Endnotes

[1] The California Children and Families State Commission, Draft Guidelines (September 9, 1999), p. 5.
[2] The distinction is based largely on funding mechanisms and their intent. For example, Head Start programs were originally designed primarily to enhance cognitive and social development and in so doing promote success in elementary school. CalWORKS child care subsidies are offered to families with the primary intent of helping that parent or guardian become employed.
[3] E.g., Entwisle and Alexander (1990); Entwisle, Alexander, Cadigan, and Pallas (1987)
[4] Stipek and Ryan (1997).
[5] Case, Griffin, and Kelly (1999)
[6] Stevenson and Newman (1986)
[7] Baydar et al. (1993).
[8] (Brooks-Gunn, Guo, and Furstenberg (1993); Luster and McAdoo (1996).
[9] Fuller, Coonerty, Kipnis and Choong (1997)
[10] Barnett (1995)
[11] Frede (1995)
[12] Heckman (1999)
[13] Berrueta-Clement et al. (1984); Schweinhart, Barnes, Weikart, Barnett and Epstein (1993); Schweinhart and Weikart (1980)
[14] Campbell and Ramey (1994)
[15] Lazar and Darlington (1982)
[16] Barnett, W. S. (1995)
[17] McKey et al. (1985)
[18] GAO (1997)
[19] Copple, Cline, and Smith (1987)
[20] Hebbeler (1985)
[21] Currie and Thomas (1995)
[22] Lee, Brooks-Gunn and Schnur (1988)
[23] Lee, Brooks-Gunn, Schnur and Liaw (1990).
[24] Reynolds, Mehana, and Temple (1995)
[25] Reynolds (1994)
[26] Barnett (1995)
[27] Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1431.
[28] Mills, Cole, Jenkins and Dale (1998).
[29] See Karoly et al. (1998) for a recent review
[30] Ramey, Bryant and Suarez (1985)
[31] Heckman (1999)
[32] Children of the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study Go to School, Executive Summary (1999)
[33] *Caring for our Children: National Health and Safety Performance Standards: Standards for Out-of-Home Child Care Programs*. Ann Arbor, Mich: American Public Health Assocaition, American Academy of Pediatrics (1992).
[34] Bryant, Burchinal, Lau, and Sparling (1994)
[35] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1998)
[36] Bryant, Burchinal, Lau, and Sparling (1994); Bryant, Peisner, and Clifford (1993)
[37] Bryant, Pesner-Feinberg, and Clifford (1993); Love, Ryer, and Faddis (1992); Whitebook, Howes, and Phillips (1989); U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1998); Children of the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study Go to School, Executive Summary (1999)
[38] Bryant, Burchinal, Lau and Sparling (1994); Frede, 1995; Layzer, Goodson and Moss (1993); Love, Ryer, and Faddis (1992); Children of the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study Go to School, Executive Summary (1999); NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (1999); Roupp, Travers, Glantz, and Coelen (1979); Berk (1985); Howes (1983)
[39] Frede, 1995; Ruopp, Travers, Glantz and Coelen (1979); Seppanen, Godin, and Metzer (1993); The Cost and quality Team (1995); Layzer, Goodson and Moss (1993); Whitebook, Howes, and Phillips (1989)
[40] Whitebook, Howes, and Phillips (1989); NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (1999)
[41] Children of the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study Go to School, Executive Summary (1999)

[42] Bryant, Burchinal, Lau and Sparling (1994)
[43] Whitehurst, Zevenbergen, Crone, Schultz, Velting, and Fischel (1999).
[44] Buysse, Wesley, Bryant, and Garner (1999); Wolery and Bredekamp (1994); Wolery, Strain and Bailey (1992)
[45] Bredekamp (1989); Bredekamp and Copple (1997); see also Bredekamp and Rosegrant (1992, 1995).
[46] Becker and Gersten (1982); Carnine, Carnine, Karp, and Weisberg (1988); Meyer, Gersten, and Gutkin (1983)
[47] Bryant, Clifford, and Peisner (1991); Durkin (1987); Educational Research Service, (1986); Hiebert (1988); Shepard and Smith (1988); Walsh (1989).
[48] (Bereiter, 1986; Carnine, Carnine, Karp, and Weisberg, 1988; Gersten, 1986; Gersten, Darch, and Gleason, 1988).
[49] Marcon, 1993; Miller and Bizzell (1983)
[50] DeVries, Reese-Learned, and Morgan (1991)
[51] Charlesworth, Hart, Burts, and DeWolf (in press, for a review). Burts, Charlesworth, and Kirk (1990); Burts, Hart, Charlesworth, Fleege, Mosley, and Thomasson, 1992).
[52] Stipek, D., Feiler, R., Byler, P., Ryan, R., Milburn, S. and Salmon, J. (1998); Stipek, D., Feiler, R., Daniels, D., and Milburn, S. (1995).
[53] Hebbeler (1985)
[54] Fuerst and Fuerst (1993)
[55] Relative care, cooperative care, recreation programs, and extended day care programs (usually offered on school sites) are "license exempt."
[56] Community Care Licensing Division of the California Department of Social Services (June, 1999, p. 3)
[57] Ibid, p.3
[58] California Work Opportunity and Responsibility for Kids
[59] Karpilow (February, 1999)
[60] 2000 Budget Analysis: Legislative Analyst's Office (March 27, 2000)
[61] Ibid, p.1.
[62] Provides support for parents as they transition off of aid, including subsidized care until the family's income exceeds the eligibility threshold. Enrollment is restricted to former CalWORKS recipients.
[63] Californa School Age Families Education (provides comprehensive services to pregnant and parenting students and their children
[64] Phillips Tebb (1998)
[65] Hathaway Family Resource Center Informational Brochure (1999)
[66] Davisson (Fall, 1999), p. 12
[67] Davisson (Fall, 1999), p. 13
[68] Davisson (Fall, 1999), p.13.
[69] Phillips Tebb (1998), p. 78.
[70] Bridges Publication (Fall, 1999, p. 16)

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)

P5030565